

## THE "EPERUM" IN ALALAH

by

ERNŐ GAÁL

During the twenty years that have passed since the publication of the texts found in the Level VII of Alalah and relating to the 18th century B. C., the greatest attention has been attracted by those in which the word *eperum* figures. Debates connected with the earlier source group of the Alalah texts have ensued only about the interpretation of this term.<sup>1</sup>

Let me briefly note the development in interpreting. The word *eperum*, occurring only in nine texts,<sup>2</sup> was translated by D. J. Wiseman, the publisher of the corpus, as "harvest", "transit-tax" and "territory".<sup>3</sup> But in his note to the AT \*56 text he put the "harvest" translation in the foreground for which the *eburum* reading<sup>4</sup> of a passage in the text provided the possibility. The reviewers of the edition rejected the "harvest" interpretation. E. A. Speiser<sup>5</sup> considered the question in connection with the AT \*56. Criticizing Wiseman's translation he stated that in Alalah usage the term conveys the meaning "contents", "capacity", as has been established in the case of Mesopotamian mathematical texts. From this he concluded that *eperum* in Alalah has the meaning of "land-mass in general, real estate, or the like". In connection with the AT \*6 J. R. Kupper<sup>6</sup> considered the "territoire" translation as correct. In AHW,<sup>7</sup> W. von Soden presented the meanings of *eperum* as "lose Erde, Staub, besondere Arten Erde, Volumen, Territorium". He listed the Alalah evidence under "Territorium", noting that this meaning relates to Syrian usage. CAD assumed the following meanings:<sup>8</sup> "dust, earth, loose earth, debris, scales, ore, mortar, territory, soil, area, volume". There the Alalah data are found under the "territory", "scil" meaning.

It appears from the foregoing that D. J. Wiseman's "harvest" interpretation has been generally rejected<sup>9</sup> and that the "territory" translation has been generally accepted.

In 1959 N. B. Jankowska revised the interpretation of this word as a Semitic/Akkadian word<sup>10</sup> and derived it from the Hurrian *ewr-roct*. She interpreted the *e-BI-ri* symbol group as *ewru*, translated it as "владение",<sup>11</sup> meaning the cultivated land of settlements, or, more exactly, the area of the common household land of the extended family.<sup>12</sup>

E. A. Draffkorn, in his dissertation written in 1959<sup>13</sup> about the Hurrian linguistic and historical material found in Alalah, did not regard the *e-BI-ri* group as the derivative of the Hurrian *ewr*-root, despite the fact that this root occurs in the personal name corpus of Alalah in several instances. Also G. Giacomakis<sup>14</sup>, whose work covers the linguistic features of Alalah Akkadian, adhered to the Akkadian etymology.

In the following we present in transcription and translation the passages in which the word *eperum* occurs, and also make reference to the contents of the tablets. Our presentation is based on the order of successive textual editions, and not on chronology.

(I) Tablet AT \*6 contains the testament of Ammitakum, ruler of Alalah. He bequeathed his property, in the presence of Iarim-Lim III, king of Iamḥad, to his son, Hammurāpi. The inheritance is described in lines 7–8 of the text as follows:

(7) É-šu<sup>1</sup> URU<sup>ki-hal</sup>-šu *e-BI-ri-šu*

(8) ù *mi-im-mu-ù-šu*

that is: "his house, his *ālums*, his *eperums* / and his all" was given Hammurāpi.<sup>15</sup>

(II) AT \*55 is a contract of sale. Ammitakum, ruler of Alalah, purchased from Sumi-Addu, son of a certain Ammitakum, *šangû*-priest the Agē *ālum*, Iaganda *ālum* and an *eperum* belonging to Taradi *ālum*, "at full price".<sup>16</sup> The term occurs three times in the following contexts:

- (a) (1) *uru A-gi-e<sup>ki</sup>*  
           *uru I-ga-an-da-an<sup>ki</sup>*  
           *pa-ta-šu-nu ga-am-ra-am*  
           *e-le-nu an-nu-ut-sú-nu*
- (5) *ša-ap-la-nu er-še-es-sú-nu*  
           *e-BI-ri za-ku-tim*  
           *ša il-kam ù<sup>1</sup> di-ku-tam*  
           ERÉN<sup>meš</sup> gišŠUKUR ZABAR  
           ù *šar-ru pá-bi-in-ni*
- (10) *la i-il-ku-ù*

that is: "The *ālum* of Agē, / the *ālum* of Iagandan, / their whole outskirts, / above, what belongs to their sky, (5) below, what belongs to their earth, / the *eperum* of exemption, / where the *ilkum* and *dikûtum*<sup>17</sup> / for the soliders' part — armed with bronze lances — / and the *šarru-babinni*<sup>18</sup> / is not given ..."

(b) and following these lines:

- (11) ù e-BI-ri ša <sup>uru</sup>Ta-ra-di<sup>ki</sup>  
 ša il-kam ù di-ku-tam i-šu-ú  
 ù šar-ru pá-bi-in-ni  
 ú-wa-a-ru-šu

“and the *eperum* of the Taradi *ālum*, / where there is *ilkum* and *dikūtum* / and the *šarru-babinni* / is sent”, these were purchased by Ammitakum.  
 (c) The term occurs in the penalty clause, too:

- (26) ša ib-ba-la-ak-ka-tu  
 l ri-ib-ba-at GUŠKIN  
 a-na É.GAL-lim ú-ma-al-la  
 ú i-na e-BI-ri-šu it-la-aš-ší

that is: “he who violates <the contract>, / <shall pay> 1000 <šiglums of> gold / to the palace / and be evicted from his *eperum*”.

(III) In tablet AT \*56 the word figures in two case in a contract of sale. Irpa-Addu, the leading merchant of Alalah, principal of the merchants, purchased from Labbina the following territories “at a full price”.<sup>19</sup>

- (a) (1) <sup>uru</sup>Ša-al-lu-un<sup>ki</sup>  
<sup>uru</sup>Ta-ar-ma-an-ni-e<sup>ki</sup>  
<sup>uru</sup>A-ma-ak-wa-an<sup>ki</sup>  
 qa-du-un pa-ti-šu-nu  
 (5) e-BI-ri ša <sup>uru</sup>I-ga-ar<sup>ki</sup>  
 e-BI-ri ša <sup>uru</sup>Ši-ip-te<sup>ki</sup>  
 e-BI-ri ša <sup>uru</sup>Ha-al-ma<sup>ki</sup>  
 e-BI-ri ša <sup>uru</sup>Ū-ri-e<sup>ki</sup>  
 e-BI-ri ša <sup>uru</sup>E-ri-ra-am-bi<sup>ki</sup>  
 (10) ù e-BI-ri-šu a-ša-ar i-ba-aš-šu-ú  
 ú-sa-an-na-aq-ma i-li-iq-qí

that is: “The *ālum* of Šallun, / the *ālum* of Tarmannē, the *ālum* of Amakwan / together with their outskirts: (5) the *eperum*, belonging to the *ālum* of Igar, / the *eperum*, belonging to the *ālum* of Šipte, / the *eperum*, belonging to the *ālum* of Halma, / the *eperum*, belonging to the *ālum* of Urē, / the *eperum*, belonging to the *ālum* of Erirambi, (10) and his *eperums* wherever situated, / are measured and he takes them.”

(b) The word figures also here in the penalty clause:

- (39) ù [š]um-[ma] <sup>m</sup>[La-ab-bi-na ib-ba-]la-ak-ka-at  
 l ri-ib-ba-at K[Û.BABBAR a-na É.GAL-lim Ì.]LAL.E



(41) *i-na e-BI-ri-šu el-li' u' [i-mi-it-la-šu]*

*in-na- {ZA} -as-sà-aḥ,*

that is: "and if [Labbina vio]lates <the contract>, / he shall pay 1000 <siglums of> silver [to the palace], / and shall be evicted from his *eperum* and [his right hand] / shall be cut off".<sup>20</sup>

(IV) In the AT \*58 contract of sale, according to which Iri-Addu and his son, Apria, have sold the *alum* of Annaše, its entire precincts, "at full price" to Talma-ammu, a distinguished person at court. In the closing part, between the penalty clause and the enumeration of the witnesses, the following condition is laid down:

(15) *e-BI-ru an-nu-ú*

*[a]-na e-BI-ri ša LÚ A-la-la-aḥ*

*ú-ul tū-uh-ḥu . . .*

(20) *ur-ra-am še-ra-am*

*LÚ A-la-la-aḥ a-na e-BI-ri an-ni-i*

*ú-ul mi-im-ma,*

that is: "this *eperum* / will not be annexed / to the *eperum* which belongs to the *awilum* of Alalah . . .", and: "later on / the *awilum* of Alalah<sup>21</sup> / shall have nothing to do / with this *eperum*".

(V) The AT \*76 is a barter agreement. Abba-il, king of Ḥalab, bartered territories with Taku, Muštalma, Eparnaḥi and Irpa-Addu:

(1) *uru Di-ma-at<sup>ki</sup>*

*a-na pu-ḥa-at*

*e-BI-ri ša uru I-tu-wa<sup>ki</sup> . . .*

(9) *a-na ši-im*

*ga-mi-ir*

*id-di-in,*

that is: "He gave the *alum* of Dimat / in exchange / at full price / for the *eperums*<sup>22</sup> which belong to the *alum* of Ituwa".<sup>23</sup>

(VI) The AT \*77 is also an exchange document. Although the context of our word is problematic, this is the most important text. Abba-il and Samsunabala, son of Maliki are the parties of contract.

(1) *a-na pu-ḥa-at*

*e-BU-ri<sup>24</sup> A.ŠA'.URU.[KI]*

*ša uru Ta-du-un-di<sup>ki</sup>*

*uru Tu-ni-id<sup>ki</sup> . . .*

(10) *a-na ši-mi-im*

*ga-am-ri-im id-di-in,*

“In exchange / for the *e-BU-ri*, for the field of the *alum*, / which belongs to the *alum* of Tadundi, / the *alum* of Tunid / ... / at full price / was given.” (VII) AT \*95 is a very fragmentary contract of sale (?).<sup>24/a</sup> In the  $x+1$  line of revers we can read the followings:

[...] *x a-la-ni ù e-BI-ri*,

that is: “*alums* and *eperums*”.<sup>25</sup> Because of the fragmentary condition of the tablet it is very difficult to bring this line into connection with the other parts of the text.<sup>26</sup>

(VIII) In AT \*456 which contains a verdict made in the presence of Iarim-Lim,<sup>27</sup> the word *eperum* occurs once. The case is the following: Šenen-šarri disinherits his two sons. Šenen-šarri owed 7000 *šiglums* of silver his wife, Abi-naḥmi, and he gave the *alum* of Airraše to his wife. Till Bendili's parents was living, untill he did not carry on a lawsuit for his inheritance. Eight years later Zilliš-Šimiga and the sons of Ehlum-atta disclosed the followings to Bendili:

(18) 5 *me-tim* KÛ.BABBAR-*ni i-na e-BI-ri*

ša<sup>uru</sup> *Mu-un-ni-ik-ki na-di-ma*

iš-tu *A-ḫi-ša-du-uq<sup>uru</sup> Mu-[u]n-ni-ik-[ki]*

5 *me-tim* KÛ.BABBAR [š]*a a-li-[...]*

*i-na<sup>uru</sup> A-i-ir-ra-še<sup>ki</sup> [ni-i]d-di*

iš-ša-ab-tu,

that is: “our 500 (*šiglums* of) silver are invested in the *eperum* / which belongs to the *alum* of Munikki / and since the *alum* of Munikki went over to Aḫi-šaquq, / the 500 (*šiglums* of) silver which [...] / <and> which we have invested in the *alum* of Airraše / have benn taken from us.”<sup>28</sup>

The matter was brought before Iarim-Lim. Since Bendili could prove that he had been disinherited, while the plaintiffs did not prove that they had invested their money, the verdict declared that they have no right to litigate further in connection with the *alum* of Airraše.

(IX) In the most important historical text of Alalah, in text AT \*456, which records the berter between Abba-il and Iarim-Lim, the later ruler of Alalah, who came from the town of Irridi, and his kingdom enjoying relative independence with Alalah as its centre, emerged as a result of this transaction, our word occurs on three occasions:

(a) (11) *a-na [p]u-ḫa-at e-BI-ri ša i-na x[...] i-ba-aš-šu-[ú...]*,

that is: “in exchange for *eperums* which are at [...]”;

(b) (47) ... *šum-ma qa-ra-an TUG Ab-ba-AN*

*ú-wa-aš-ša-ru-ma qa-ra-an TÚG LUGAL ša-ni-im*

*i-ša-ab-ba-tu i-na URU<sup>ki.há</sup> ù e-BI-ri*

*ù-[ta-aš-ši],*

that is: "if letting go the hem of the robe of Abba-il / <Iarim-Lim> grasps the hem of the robe of another king, / he shall be evicted from the *ālums* and the *eperums*."

(c) The former penalty clause occurs in connection with the successors of Iarim-Lim, too:

- (53) [š]um-ma qa-ra-an TÚG Ab-ba-AN ù qa-r[a-an]  
 TÚG wa-ar-ki-it Ab-ba-AN ú-wa-[aš-ša-ru]-ma  
 [q]a-ra-an TÚG LUGAL ša-ni-im i-ša-a[b-ba-tu]  
 [i-na] URU<sup>ki.há</sup>-šu ù e-BI-ri-š[u]  
 [it]-ta-aš-ši<sup>29</sup>

that is: "if letting go the hem of the robe of Abba-il, and the hem of the robe of Abba-il's successors, / and he (i.e. Iarim-Lim or his successors) grasps the hem of the robe of another king / he shall be evicted from his *ālums* and *eperums*".

Disregarding earlier interpretations of the term, let us now examine in what context *eperum* occurs in the instances we have cited.

We find that word occurs in most cases in the

*e*-BI-ri ša/ina<sup>uru</sup>(city-name)<sup>ki</sup>

formula.<sup>30</sup> In these cases the *eperum* belongs to a certain *ālum*.

In other cases *ālum* and *eperum* are not coordinated through the ša/ina relationship, but by means of the connective *u*.<sup>31</sup>

It is also evident that in the contracts of sale the *ālums* are sold either with all their precincts, or only the *eperum* belonging to the *ālum* is sold.<sup>32</sup>

In our opinion, the relationship between the "entire precincts" (*pātum gamrum*) and the *eperum* is one of a whole and its part. These two words denotes entities the difference of which is only quantitative. In these cases *eperum* means a certain part of the territory, or "precincts" (*pātum*) of a certain *ālum*; a piece of land of indeterminate size. We avoid the expression "territory of land" on purpose because N. B. Janowska, making reference to A. A. Vaiman's verbal communication, rejected the "territorium" translation, and the derivation of the word from a Semitic root<sup>33</sup> (according to A. A. Vaiman, *eperum* never means in the mathematical texts what E. A. Speiser has attributed to it, i.e. "contents", "capacity", on the basis of which Speiser has rejected the "harvest, transit-tax" translation as a criticism of D. J. Wiseman's interpretation).

Our definition given above seems to be supported by the three *ana puḫat* formulas which occur in the texts containing also the *eperum*.<sup>34</sup>

The three barter-formulas are as follows:



(1) AT \*76: 1–3.

<sup>uru</sup>Di-ma-at<sup>ki</sup> / a-na-pu-ḥa-at / e-BI-ri ša <sup>uru</sup>I-tu-wa<sup>ki</sup>

(2) AT \*77: 1–4.

a-na-pu-ḥa-at / e-BU-ri A.ŠA<sup>1</sup> URU.[KI] / ša <sup>uru</sup>Ta-du-un-di<sup>ki</sup>  
 / <sup>uru</sup>Tu-ni-id<sup>ki</sup>

(3) AT \*456: 10–12.

<sup>uru</sup>Ad-ra-te<sup>ki</sup> / a-na-pu-ḥa-at e-BI-ri ša i-na x[x] / i-ba-aš-šu-[ú...]

Based on the identity of content and structure in the three passages, the e-BU-ri sign group in the 2nd line of AT \*77 can be regarded with good reason as a scribal error, and corrected into the e-BI-ri form. Further, it appears clearly from the three parallel passages of the text that the A.ŠA URU.KI complement in AT \*77: 2 is the apposition of *eperum*. A.ŠA URU.KI/eqel ālim, “the land of ālum”, may serve as a further proof that *eperum* is nothing else but a part of the “precincts” (*pāṭum*) of the ālum.

There are also passages in which *eperum* occurs in a somewhat wider sense. For example, in the AT \*55 the expression e-BI-ri za-ku-tim, “the *eperums* of exemption”, relates to two ālums, to Agē and Igandan, which were sold together with their entire precincts. This is the case also with the AT \*58, where it relates to the ālum of Annaše. In my view, it may be understood simply as the synonym of A.ŠA URU.KI in these cases.

Summing up the foregoing, and relying only on the internal connections of the texts, we may conclude that *eperum* means the land, the precincts of ālum, or, in a more restricted sense, a certain plot of land in the precincts of the ālum.<sup>35</sup>

So far we have not yet given our reasons why we do not regard as justified to interpret *eperum* as the Hurrian *ewru*; anyway, the meaning we have discerned is not diametrically opposed to the interpretation of N. B. Jankowska. But this is not simply a matter of the etymology of a word. In this concrete case the acceptance of the suggested Hurrian etymology also means that we must accept the theory developed on the basis of the Arrapha material as well, the theory which assumes the existence of the system of the common household land of extended families, and that we must accept it also in respect of Alalah in the 18th century B. C.

Our first remark is technical one. The word *eperum* occurs in the Alalah corpus of the 18th century B. C., mostly in the material that has become partly Hurrian only in respect of the name material.<sup>36</sup> We cannot agree with the starting-point of N. B. Jankowska's theory either, i.e. with her interpretation of the AT \*6 text. In Jankowska's opinion the Alalah sources present the e-BI-ri land as one which is in the collective use of the inhabitants of the settlement. The obligations which are attached to the e-BI-ri holding can be transferred to another settlement if that piece of land is purchased (AT \*55). It is also likely that there existed a certain organization which comprised several settlements. That the

obligations were redistributed according to needs, may have been also possible within such a community. It appears from the AT \*6 testament that the *e-BI-ri* of several settlements was under the disposal of a single *bītum*, a "house". Or, more clearly, a domestic community ("Hausgemeinschaft, общинная община") had disposal over it, and its ownership was inherited by the person who was in possession of the right of the *bēlum* ("lord"). The concept of *bēlum* corresponds to the Hurrian *ewri*.<sup>37</sup>

As we have indicated in connection with the AT \*6 testament, the text speaks not of the *ālums* belonging to the *ewri/bēlum* right of Ammitakum,<sup>38</sup> but of his *ālums* and *eperums*. This is supported by the fact that Ammitakum himself purchased not only *ālums*, but also *eperums*.<sup>39</sup> Also, *bēlum* occurs in the testament in a variety of contexts. The making of the will took place in the presence of Iarim-Lim III, i.e. before the *bēlum* of Ammitakum,<sup>40</sup> and Hammurāpi inherited not only Ammitakum's movable and immovable property, but "inherited" Iarim-Lim as well: the ruler of Halab becomes his *bēlum*, too, and he becomes the *wardum* of the latter.<sup>41</sup> As the text runs, "together with this, the *bēlum* of my *alum* and my house (i.e. of the settlement of Ammitakum and his house) is he (i.e. Hammurāpi)".<sup>42</sup> In my opinion, the *É* in the text means both royal economy and the dynasty.<sup>43</sup>

In the AT \*55 text, Sumi-Addu sold two *ālums*, which were exempt from the services *ilkum* and *dikūtum*, and an *eperum* for which these obligations held. According to a passage in the clause, if, in the settlements sold as *ālums* enjoying exemption, service were nevertheless due, in this case "Sumi-Addu shall be hit by the thrown stone" i.e. — perhaps — he shall be stoned to death (?).<sup>44</sup> There is no indication that the obligations should be transferred to another settlement.

Nor can it be shown that the *e-BI-ri* should be a land which is in the common, collective use of the settlement. We only know about the joint assumption of surety, of the joint assumption of responsibility by the territorial community.<sup>45</sup>

On the basis of the Alalah material of the 18th century B. C., we can form a certain image of the *alum* only; our evidence concerning the land-ownership of particular families are insufficient. In our text, father and son, mother and son, man and married woman figure as sellers; the ruler of Alalah, a woman belonging to the king's family, and a person intimate with the court appear as buyers. Of the buyers we know somewhat more, but of the sellers we actually know nothing, except their names. What we can establish is that the existence of the *pater familias* of the Hurrian type<sup>46</sup> cannot be proved in Alalah. Šenen-šarri and his wife, Abi-naḥmi, may serve as a good example; in return for the loan taken from his wife, the husband must surrender to her the *alum* of Airraše (AT \*455). Urubaltum, the wife of the blacksmith Duru, sells her vineyard of 2 *ikū* size to Samsi-Addu (AT \*63). Also a woman, Summunabi appears as a buyer of land in the AT \*64 text.



Our second remark is an objection of philological nature. N. B. Jankowska enumerates many examples to show that the semi-vowels *w* can be rendered not only with the usual PI sign, but also with the BI.<sup>47</sup> At the same time she remarks that in the Tell Billa material the first element in the Ewri-šarri name is written as IB-RI.<sup>48</sup> But in her other examples the *ewr*-root appears nowhere, while the traditional orthography is *ib/ip/iw-ri* in the name material containing the *ewr*-root.<sup>49</sup> In Alalah we are in a fortunate situation with respect to the name material containing this root; only the *ewri* form occurs in the Nuzi material, but here the *iwaru* of Hittite sources also occurs as a variant.<sup>50</sup> Hence both the *ewri/ewir* and *ewari* occurs in the Alalah name material of the 18th century B. C., even in the material of 15–14th century. The *ewari* variant dominates on the 18th century material, while *ewri* on the younger level. But the latter is never written with the *e-BI-ri* sign group.

The *ewr*-root occurs in the following compounds:

- \*Ewri-bēli : *Ib-ri-be-li*, AT 182:21
- \*Ewri-geāze : *Ib-ri-gi-a-še*, AT 351:16
- \*Ewri-guda : *EN-hu-ta*, AT 67:2; 68:7; 72:3  
*Ib-ri-hu-ta*, AT 89:5; 420:7  
*EN<sup>ri</sup>-hu-ta*, AT 394:2
- \*Ewri-Išhara : *Ib-ri-<sup>d</sup>Iš-ha-ra*, AT \*60:9
- \*Ewri-kašali : *Ib-ri-qa-ša-li*, AT 159:4
- \*Ewri-muža : *Ib-ri-mu-ša*, AT 342:11  
*E-wi-ir-mu-ša*, AT \*367:6.<sup>51</sup>

Based on the argument presented above – since the domestic land-community organization of the extended family of the Nuzi type cannot be proved to have existed, and since the *e-BI-ri* sign group differs from the well-documented orthography of the *ewr*-root – we cannot accept N. B. Jankowska's etymology which wants to derive the *eperum* word from the Hurrian language. This means that we adhere to the earlier, Semitic etymology of the word. But we do accept A. A. Vaiman's objections – mentioned by N. B. Jankowska – to the earlier definition of the meaning of this word. Consequently we interpret the *eperum* not as territory, but as a piece of land that belongs to the *alum*, to the percinets of the *alum*; or – in a wider sense – simply as “land”. In this interpretation the semantic content of the word does not comprise size and dimensions; it has only one attribute, namely, that it belongs to an *alum*, to the percinets of a settlement.

As a conclusion I should like to suggest that the word *eperum* may possibly have had an administrative significance in Alalah. We know that the rulers of Alalah purchased not only complete *alums*, but also *eperums* smaller than the *alums*.<sup>52</sup> In this way the royal(state) household was intersticed with the larger *alums* whose percinets were owned not by one person, but by more, i.e. the owners of the given *eperums*. Thus the ruler became member of the given territorial community of

land (civic community), and joined in the management of the given *alum*, if not personally on every case, but through the enforcements of his rights. But, owing to the meagreness of the evidence available, the extent of this process cannot be determined for the time being.

## NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> Text editions: *D. J. Wiseman: The Alalakh Tablets. Occasional Publications of the British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara*, No. 2. London 1953. (Hereafter abbreviated as AT. The \*preceding the text number indicates the Level VII.); *D. J. Wiseman: Supplementary Copies of the Alalakh Tablets. JCS 8 (1954) 1–30*; here is published in transliteration and translation the AT \*455, too; *D. J. Wiseman: Abban and Alalakh. JCS 12(1958) 124–129*, with the publication of AT \*456.
- <sup>2</sup> See the following enumeration.
- <sup>3</sup> AT 160, Selected Vocabulary.
- <sup>4</sup> AT \*77:2.
- <sup>5</sup> *E. A. Speiser: The Alalakh Tablets (rec.). JAOS 74(1954) 18–25.*
- <sup>6</sup> *J.-R. Kupper: BiOr 7(1950) 175–176.*
- <sup>7</sup> *W. von Soden: AHw 222–223.*
- <sup>8</sup> CAD E 184–190.
- <sup>9</sup> I should like to note that in the publication of AT \*456 (JCS 12[1958]), Wiseman accepts, in his note to the line 11, Speiser's suggestion: "*epiri* may have the technical meaning of real estate or of the land mass".
- <sup>10</sup> *N. B. Jankowska: Землевание большеесемейных домовых общин в клинописных источниках. ВДИ 1959 No. 1, 35–51* (hereafter referred to as ZBDO) – *Id.: Из истории хурритского общества по материалам юридических документов из Аррапхи. Москва 1960, 12* – *N. Jankowska: Zur Geschichte der hurritischen Gesellschaft (Auf Grund von Rechtsurkunden aus Arrapha). Moskau 1960, 17* = *Труды XXV Международного Конгресса Востоковедов, I. Москва 1962, 226–232*, hereafter referred to as *Zur Geschichte...*).
- <sup>11</sup> *N. B. Jankowska: ZBDO 39, ewri „владелец“ ewru „владение“; cf. I. M. Diakonoff: Проблемы экономики. О структуре общества Ближнего Востока до середины II тыс. до н. э. ВДИ 1968 No. 3, 9, note 26: „... в текстах e-bu-ru и др., но часто и в форме e-bi-ri, чит. [ew(i)ri], – форма аккадского родительного падежа или множ. числа от \*ewru – хурр. \*ewro).*
- <sup>12</sup> *N. B. Jankowska: ZBDO 40: „Во всех перечисленных случаях ew(i)ri это владения граждан, которые они продают, причем покупателями выступают либо правители Алалаха, либо дворцовые должностные лица, следовательно, ew(i)ri были расположены на землях, не входивших в фонд государственных земель.“ (NB. ewru ought to stand here! cf. note 11). – N. B. Jankowska: Zur Geschichte... 2: „e-bi-ri der Alalah-Tafeln... bezeichnet wohl sicherlich den Bauten Boden der Siedlungen“. Cf. also I. M. Diakonoff: *op. cit.* 9 f.*
- <sup>13</sup> *E. A. Draffkorn: Hurrians and Hurrian at Alalah: An Ethno-Linguistic Analysis. University of Pennsylvania 1959.*
- <sup>14</sup> *G. Giacomakis: The Akkadian of Alalah. Janua Linguarum, Series Practica 59. The Hague 1970.*
- <sup>15</sup> I cannot agree with N. B. Jankowska's interpretation, ZBDO 40: „Аммитаку передает своему сыну дом ew(i)ri каждого своего поселения и свое имущество“. The URU<sup>ki-hal</sup>-šu and the e-BI-ri-šu are not in possessive relation with each other, this is simply an enumeration. Nor can we agree with the notes N. B. Jankowska added to lines 18–22 of the text. Hammurāpi inherited not a part of a territorial community household, but the *alums* of Ammitakum, the royal(state) household of the ruler of Alalah as a whole! The text is concerned with the designation of the only heir, with the naming of the heir to the throne (cf. lines 9–14). The É-būu in the text means also the "dynasty" (see line 6: šī-im-ti É-šu i-šī-im-ma, "deciding the lot of his house").



- <sup>16</sup> N. B. Jankowska: ZBDO 39, note 19.
- <sup>17</sup> The pair of words occurs also in line 20 of the text. As opposed to N. B. Jankowska's interpretation (ZBDO 39), according to which it is not *ki-tum* that figures beside the *ikum*, but it is *di-(ku)-tum* which a scribal error; the DI sign can be clearly distinguished from the KI sign.
- <sup>18</sup> E. A. Draffkorn: op. cit., 202 f.
- <sup>19</sup> For the lands sold, Labbina received, in addition to the money and the part in kind of the price, a life annuity from the purchaser, i.e. not all the rights of the 100 *ikū* land marked out in the *alum* of Laqqa, but only its yield, the usufructuary right of the land, as it were; cf. N. B. Jankowska: ZBDO 39, note 20 and 40, note 23.
- <sup>20</sup> According to the penal clause relating to the buyer, Irpa-Addu (lines 35–38), if he violates the contract he has to pay 1000 *šiglums* of silver as punishment to the palace, and in addition he cannot claim his money (which he has spent on the purchase), and his right hand will be cut off. If we compare this passage of the clause with the one that relates to Labbina, it appears that if the contract is violated by him, he will not get back the land he has sold for the punishment – 1000 *šiglums* of silver – he has to pay to the palace, although the contract is no longer valid. In my opinion, it is not the 100 *ikū* of Laqqa land that he will lose, since this was given to him only for usufruct. Cf. N. B. Jankowska: ZBDO 40.
- <sup>21</sup> It would be very difficult to decide to whom the LÚ Alalah expression of the text refers. It may mean, as it does in other cases the ruler of Alalah, but it may also be conceived as referring to Zigilkiba who is among the witnesses to the contract (see line 27), since he also bears the LÚ Alalah denotation. In view of the meagreness of evidence, it is not advisable to take a premature stand. Here N. B. Jankowska thinks of the ruler of Alalah, see ZBDO 40.
- <sup>22</sup> This form may be the plural as well; cf. AT \*56:10, \*456:10 where the plural form of *bašū* stands beside them. We must think of the plural also because of the four men of Ituwa, since we do not know about their family relationships: all the four were owners of an *eperum*.
- <sup>23</sup> N. B. Jankowska: ZBDO 40; she reads the name of the settlement in the Iliwa form.
- <sup>24</sup> This is the text on whose basis D. J. Wiseman assumed the “harvest” meaning (*eburum*, “Ernte”, see W. von Soden: AHW 183–184). Wiseman's opinion on the passage is adopted also by H. Klengel, although he remarks that this would be the only instance of this meaning of the word in the entire material of Alalah, see H. Klengel: Geschichte Syriens, I. Berlin 1965. 139, note 37; cf. G. Giacomakis: op. cit., 72: “harvest”, “crop”.
- <sup>24a</sup> A new interpretation was given by N. Na'aman: A New Look at the Chronology of Alalah level VII. AnSt 16(1966) 134.
- <sup>25</sup> N. B. Jankowska: ZBDO 40; here she also puts the two concepts in the possessive relation as in AT \*6:7.
- <sup>26</sup> N. B. Jankowska: ZBDO 40; she thinks it important to stress the [...be-] *el zi-ūt-[t] i-im* expression of AT \*95: x+18 line, even if it is not certain that it relates to Ammitakum, because in her Zur Geschichte ... 17, note 1, the *ana zitti* expression in the Gadd 44 text is the synonym of *ana i-wi-ri*. In AT \*456:38, *zittu* meaning the totality of the *alums* made over to Iarim-Lim in the course of the barter, relates to the property of Iarim-Lim, while in the instances enumerated in paragraph XI the expression *eperum* also occurs. Cf. CAD Z 140, 1.3: “(part of the) estate”.
- <sup>27</sup> In default of a date it cannot be accurately established which Iarim-Lim is concerned.
- <sup>28</sup> It may be assumed that they invested their money into an *eperum* also in the *alum* of Airraše.
- <sup>29</sup> The passage was published repeatedly, in transcription and translation, E. A. Draffkorn: Was King Abba-An a Vizier for the King of Hattuša? JCS 13(1959) 94–97.
- <sup>30</sup> The expression *ša ina* (i.e. both together) figures in one case, AT \*456:11.
- <sup>31</sup> AT \*6:7 does not write the *u* connective. By contrast, the *-šu* singular, third-person, masculine possessive personal suffix is there in both words. This proves that here, just as in line x+1 on the reverse of AT \*95, it is an enumeration.
- <sup>32</sup> In my opinion, even on the cases where the term “together with all its precincts” does not appear after the name of the sold *alum*, it means always the sale of both the *alum* and the entire land belonging to it.



- <sup>33</sup> N. B. Jankowska: ZBDO 37, note 13.
- <sup>34</sup> On the use of this formula in Alalah, see E. A. Draffkorn: JCS 13(1959) 94, note 5.
- <sup>35</sup> Even if we take into account only the source material outside Alalah as published in CAD E 184–190 under *eperum* 8, "territory, soil", we may conclude that our interpretation holds true in the face of these passages as well.
- <sup>36</sup> Cf. E. A. Draffkorn: Hurrians ... 246 ff.
- <sup>37</sup> N. B. Jankowska: Zur Geschichte ... 4–5; in Russian, Id.: Из истории ... 3–4.
- <sup>38</sup> See note 15.
- <sup>39</sup> AT \*55:11.
- <sup>40</sup> AT \*6: 4–5, IGI *Ia-ri-im-li-im* LUGAL / *be-li-šu*.
- <sup>41</sup> AT \*6:21–24, m*Ha-am-mu-ra-pi-be-el* URU.KI-ia / *ù É-ia šu-ù* / *ù IRdu ša Ia-ri-im-li-im* / *be-li-ia šu-ù*.
- <sup>42</sup> AT \*6:21–24.
- <sup>43</sup> In M. Diakonoff: *op. cit.*, 29; cf. note 15 above.
- <sup>44</sup> AT \*55: 24–25, the interpretation of ZÁ *ma-gi-it-tum*/UGU *Su-mi-a-du* is problematic; see G. Giacomakis: *op. cit.*, 87, perhaps from the verb *maqātum*.
- <sup>45</sup> AT \*32; \*33.
- <sup>46</sup> I. M. Diakonoff: *op. cit.*, 7 ff.
- <sup>47</sup> N. B. Jankowska: ZBDO 38.
- <sup>48</sup> Ibid., note 17.
- <sup>49</sup> A. Kammenhuber: Hurrische Nomina. Gedenkschrift für W. Brandenstein. Innsbruck 1969. 255.
- <sup>50</sup> E. A. Draffkorn: Hurrians ... 30–31, 74:  
     \**Ewari*: E-wa-ri, AT 210:9,  
     \**Ewari-ba*: E-wa-ri-ba, AT \*25:10,  
     \**Ewari-gi-ba*: E-wa-ri-ki-ba, AT \*18:15, \*25:8,  
     \**Ewari-gawe*: E-wa-ri-ḫa-ù-we, AT \*383:2,  
     \**Ewcri-na*: E-wa-ri-na, AT \*59:13,  
     \**Ewar-nage*: E-pa-ar-na-ḫi, AT \*367:6.
- <sup>51</sup> E. A. Draffkorn: *ibid.*, 30–31, 75.
- <sup>52</sup> See note 37.
- <sup>53</sup> I should like to express my thanks to I. M. Diakonoff and to N. B. Jankowska for discussing the contents of this paper with me during my stay in Leningrad.